



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/552,240

10/07/2005

David Lloyd Danielson

DC5120 PCT1

8813

137

7590

03/02/2009

DOW CORNING CORPORATION CO1232

2200 W. SALZBURG ROAD

P.O. BOX 994

MIDLAND, MI 48686-0994

EXAMINER

COOLEY, CHARLES E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/02/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents.admin@dowcorning.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/552,240	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DANIELSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Charles E. Cooley	<b>Art Unit</b> 1797	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 October 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **FINAL OFFICE ACTION**

### ***Priority***

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

### ***Specification***

2. This substitute abstract filed 23 DEC 2008 is objected to because it contains prohibited legal phraseology such as "means".

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
4. The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as the specification, as originally filed, does not provide support for the invention as is now claimed.
5. The first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 requires that the "specification shall contain a written description of the invention." This requirement is separate and distinct from the enablement requirement. See, e.g., *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1560, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1114 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See also *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 358 F.3d 916, 920-23, 69 USPQ2d 1886, 1890-93 (Fed. Cir.2004)

Art Unit: 1797

(discussing history and purpose of the written description requirement); *In re Curtis*, 354 F.3d 1347, 1357, 69 USPQ2d 1274, 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ("conclusive evidence of a claim's enablement is not equally conclusive of that claim's satisfactory written description"). The written description requirement has several policy objectives. "[T]he essential goal' of the description of the invention requirement is to clearly convey the information that an applicant has invented the subject matter which is claimed." *In re Barker*, 559 F.2d 588, 592 n.4, 194 USPQ 470, 473 n.4 (CCPA 1977). Another objective is to put the public in possession of what the applicant claims as the invention. See *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1566, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1997), cert. denied, 523 U.S. 1089 (1998). "The written description requirement implements the principle that a patent must describe the technology that is sought to be patented; the requirement serves both to satisfy the inventor's obligation to disclose the technologic knowledge upon which the patent is based, and to demonstrate that the patentee was in possession of the invention that is claimed." *Capon v. Eshhar*, 418 F.3d 1349, 1357, 76 USPQ2d 1078, 1084 (Fed. Cir. 2005). Further, the written description requirement promotes the progress of the useful arts by ensuring that patentees adequately describe their inventions in their patent specifications in exchange for the right to exclude others from practicing the invention for the duration of the patent's term.

To satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. See,

Art Unit: 1797

e.g., *Moba, B.V. v. Diamond Automation, Inc.*, 325 F.3d 1306, 1319, 66 USPQ2d 1429, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116. However, a showing of possession alone does not cure the lack of a written description. *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.*, 323 F.3d 956, 969-70, 63 USPQ2d 1609, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

The limitation in amended claim 1 regarding the "(vii) a programmable logic computer so constructed and arranged to transmit the driven speed of the servo motor driven pumps for the liquid elastomer to the servo motor driven pumps for the additive" is not supported by the originally filed specification. Applicant states that this subject matter is supported by page 5, lines 8-10 of the originally filed specification, however, this passage recites that "[t]he resolver on the base servo motor then transmits the driven speed of the base motor to a programmable logic controlling computer, whereby the pigment/additive pump rate will be set based on the desired mixing ratio." Thus, according to the specification, the driven speed of the elastomer base motor is transmitted to the computer (not the speed of the elastomer pump which pump speed differs from the elastomer servo motor by virtue of the gear reduction between the drive motor and the driven pump) and the driven speed signal of the elastomer base motor is transmitted to the computer, not to the pump for the additive, as now claimed.

6. Claims 1-5 are thereby rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The terms used in this respect are given their broadest reasonable interpretation in their ordinary usage in context as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, in light of the written description in the specification, including the drawings, without reading into the claim any disclosed limitation or particular embodiment. See, e.g., *In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The Examiner interprets claims as broadly as reasonable in view of the specification, but does not read limitations from the specification into a claim. *Elekta Instr. S.A.v.O.U.R. Sci. Int'l, Inc.*, 214 F.3d 1302, 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2000). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. Inc. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**9. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Langeman (US 5,388,761).**

Langeman discloses a mixing apparatus comprising a mixing device 84; servo motor driven pumps 24A, 24B; supply means 22A, 22B, 46A, 46B for supplying

Art Unit: 1797

materials to the pumps; mixture dispensing means 26; a computer 32A, 32B so constructed and arranged to control the operation of the servo motor driven pumps so that a predetermined ratio of RPM between the servo motor driven pumps for the is maintained irrespective of pressure surges in the supply means (col. 7, lines 43-50); temperature control means 36A, 36B. With respect to the revisions made to claim 1, the pumps 24A and 24B are power driven gear type metering pumps that meter the flow of the materials passing therethrough to the mixing device 84 (see Figs. 3-4 and col. 6, lines 20-32 and col. 7, lines 27-32). The speed of master motor 28B is transmitted to a computer 32B wherein the speed (and thus the rate of the other pump - slave pump 32A) is set based upon the desired mixing ratio so that a predetermined ratio of RPM between the servo motor driven pump for the first material and the servo motor driven pumps for the other material is maintained, irrespective of pressure surges in the supply means for the materials (col. 6, line 63 – col. 7, line 57; col. 8, line 66 – col. 9, line 38; and col. 11, lines 1-41).

Regarding claims 2-3, the substances worked upon does not limit apparatus claims and is not a major consideration when determining the patentability of said apparatus claims (MPEP 2115). “Expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim.” *Ex parte Thibault*, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969). Furthermore, “[i]nclusion of material or article worked upon by a structure being claimed does not impart patentability to the claims.” *In re Young*, 75 F.2d 966, 25 USPQ 69 (CCPA 1935) (as restated in *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963)).

Art Unit: 1797

Accordingly, the recited elastomer and pigment of claims 2-3 does not limit the scope of the claimed apparatus.

Regarding claim 4, the recited ratio is but a method of operation of the pumps which does not limit the claimed apparatus. Nevertheless, Langeman clearly teaches the operational step of setting a desired ratio between the speeds of the motors/pumps at col. 8, line 66-68.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. To determine whether subject matter would have been obvious, "the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved .... Such secondary considerations as commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, failure of others, etc., might be utilized to give light to the circumstances surrounding the origin of the subject matter sought to be patented."

*Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966).

The Supreme Court has noted:

Often, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue.

*KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740-41 (2007). "Under the correct analysis, any need or problem known in the field of endeavor at the time of invention



Art Unit: 1797

and addressed by the patent can provide a reason for combining the elements in the manner claimed." (Id. at 1742).

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**13. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langeman (US 5,388,761) in view of Reynolds (US 4,915,160).**

Langeman does not disclose temperature compensation algorithm means for compensating fluctuations occurring in the temperature of at least one of the components of the mixture.

The patent to Reynolds teaches a mixing apparatus comprising a mixing device 6; servo motor driven pumps 4, 5; supply means (Fig. 1) for supplying materials to the

Art Unit: 1797

pumps; mixture dispensing means 1; a computer 12, 15 so constructed and arranged to control the operation of the servo motor driven pumps (Fig. 2); and temperature compensation algorithm means 11, 14, 16, 17, 18 for compensating for fluctuations in the temperature of one of mixture components. It would have been obvious and mere common sense to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to have provided the mixing apparatus of Langeman with temperature compensation algorithm means as taught by Reynolds for the purposes of providing temperature data to the computer indicative of the temperature of one or more of the mixture components such that the feed rate of one or more of the components fed to the mixer via the pumps is controlled to achieve a desired mixture over a range of temperatures (col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 47 and col. 5, lines 8-28).

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

14. None.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

15. Applicant's arguments filed 23 DEC 2008 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant is reminded that “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The factual determination of anticipation requires

Art Unit: 1797

the disclosure in a single reference of every element of the claimed invention, either explicitly or inherently. See *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477 (Fed. Cir. 1997). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an ipsissimis verbis test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Turning to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), it is noted that the terminology in a pending application's claims is to be given its broadest reasonable interpretation (*In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989)) and limitations from a pending application's specification will not be read into the claims (*Sjolund v. Musland*, 847 F.2d 1573, 1581-82, 6 USPQ2d 2020, 2027 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is established only when a single prior art reference discloses, either expressly or under the principles of inherency, each and every element of a claimed invention. See *Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.*, 848 F.2d 1560, 1570, 7 USPQ2d 1057, 1064 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 488 U.S. 892 (1988); *RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Sys., Inc.*, 730 F.2d 1440, 1444, 221 USPQ 385, 388 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Moreover, anticipation by a prior art reference does not require either the inventive concept of the claimed subject matter or the recognition of properties that are inherently possessed by the prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers Inc. v. Union Oil co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 633, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1054 (Fed. Cir. 1987), cert. denied, 484 U.S. 827 (1987). A prior art reference anticipates the subject

Art Unit: 1797

matter of a claim when that reference discloses each and every element set forth in the claim (*In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1478-79, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994) and *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1657 (Fed. Cir. 1990)); however, the law of anticipation does not require that the reference teach what Applicant is claiming, but only that the claims "read on" something disclosed in the reference. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 772, 218 USPQ 781, 789 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 465 U.S. 1026 (1984) (and overruled in part on another issue), *SRI Intel v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. Of Am.*, 775 F.2d 1107, 1118, 227 USPQ 577, 583 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Also, a reference anticipates a claim if it discloses the claimed invention such that a skilled artisan could take its teachings in combination with his own knowledge of the particular art and be in possession of the invention. See *In re Graves*, 69 F.3d 1147, 1152, 36 USPQ2d 1697, 1701 (Fed. Cir. 1995), cert. denied, 116 S.Ct. 1362 (1996), quoting from *In re LeGrice*, 301 F.2d 929, 936, 133 USPQ 365, 372 (CCPA 1962).

With respect to the applied prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the examiner has explicitly demonstrated how the reference discloses each and every element set forth in the claims and how the pending claims read on the disclosure of the reference, hence the rejection is considered proper.

With regard to Langeman, Applicant refers to characteristics of the instant invention such as variable flow rate through the pumps, back pressure, temperature fluctuation, no need for separate elastomer holding tanks, etc., however, none of this subject matter appears in claims 1-4. Such arguments are of no patentable

Art Unit: 1797

consequence because it is well settled that features not claimed may not be relied upon in support of patentability. *In re Self*, 671 F.2d 1344, 213 USPQ 1 (CCPA 1982).

Although a claim should be interpreted in light of the specification disclosure, it is generally considered improper to read limitations contained in the specification into the claims. See *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969) and *In re Winkhaus*, 527 F.2d 637, 188 USPQ 129 (CCPA 1975), which discuss the premise that one cannot rely on the specification to impart limitations to the claim that are not recited in the claim.

Contrary to Applicant's assertion, the pumps 24A and 24B in Langeman are power driven gear type metering pumps that meter the flow of the materials passing therethrough to the mixing device 84 (see Figs. 3-4 and col. 6, lines 20-32 and col. 7, lines 27-32). As set forth by the instant specification and the latter portion of claim 1, the speed of the motors 28A and 28B in Langeman (and thus of the driven pumps 24A and 24B – col. 9, lines 35-38) are controlled by the computer 32A and/or 32B such that a predetermined ratio of RPM between the pumps 24A and 24B is maintained, irrespective of pressure surges in the supply means (col. 6, line 63 – col. 7, line 57; col. 8, line 66 – col. 9, line 38; and col. 11, lines 1-41). Thus, if the speed of master motor 28B fluctuates due to a surge in the system (and thus the flow rate of the pump 24B driven thereby), the speed of the slave motor 28A (and this the flow rate of the slave pump 24A) will automatically change with it, to maintain the component ratio (col. 11, lines 19-41). Therefore, contrary to Applicant's conclusion, the Langeman system is indeed automatically responsive to changes in flow of a pump (e.g., the master pump

Art Unit: 1797

when a surge occurs) as discussed above. That is, the flow rate of the slave pump 24A is continually adjusted by the computer to compensate for changing flow rate through the master pump 24B, e.g., when surges occur in the system.

Regarding the temperature fluctuation and new claim 5, the patent to Reynolds clearly teaches an analogous mixing apparatus that includes temperature compensation algorithm means 11, 14, 16, 17, 18 for compensating for fluctuations in the temperature of one of mixture components. To have provided the mixing apparatus of Langeman with temperature compensation algorithm means as taught by Reynolds for the purposes of providing temperature data to the computer indicative of the temperature of one or more of the mixture components such that the feed rate of one or more of the components fed to the mixer via the pumps is controlled to achieve a desired mixture over a range of temperatures would have been prima facie obvious to one skilled in the art. Applicant argues that Reynolds has computers and motors that do not function in the claimed manner, however, Reynolds is not relied upon for such teachings. Reynolds is relied upon for the recited temperature compensation algorithm means in an analogous mixing system. The examiner notes that "[n]on-obviousness cannot be established by attacking references individually where the rejection is based upon the teachings of a combination of references," *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 1097 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

***Conclusion***

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION. ANY RESPONSE FILED AFTER THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL REJECTION WILL BE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF MPEP 714.12 AND 714.13.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Cooley in Art Unit 1797 whose telephone number is (571) 272-1139. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1797

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Charles E. Cooley/

Charles E. Cooley  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1797

26 February 2009